arXiv:1511.01383v1 [math.LO] 4 Nov 2015

Weak Gödel's incompleteness property for some decidable versions of the calculus of relations

MOHAMED KHALED

Department of Mathematics and its applications, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Cairo University, Giza, Egypt

Abstract

Relativization is one of the central topics in the study of algebras of relations. Some relativized relation algebras behave much nicer than the original relation algebras. In this paper, we study the atomicity of the finitely generated free algebras of these nice classes of relativized relation algebras. In particular, we give an answer for the open problem, posed by I. Németi in 1985, which asks whether the finitely generated free algebras of the class of the weak associative relation algebras WA are atomic or not.

1 Introduction

The first order predicate calculus has its origins in the calculus of relations. The calculus of relations was created and developed in the second half of the nineteenth century by De Morgan, Peirce and Schröder. The creation of this calculus was the result of the continuous efforts searching for a "good general algebra of logic". But these efforts took place decades before the emergence of first order calculus. The early notation for quantifiers originates with Peirce. Löwenheim's original version of the Löwenheim-Skolem theorem, c.f. (Löwenheim, 1915), is not a theorem about first order logic but about the calculus of relations.

In 1940, Tarski proposed an axiomatization for a large part of the calculus of relations. In the next decades Tarski's axiomatization led to the creation of the theory of relation algebras which was shown to be incomplete by Lyndon's discovery of nonrepresentable relation algebras. Alfred Tarski showed that mathematics can be built up in the equational theory of the relation algebras, hence it is undecidable (Tarski and Givant, 1987). He raised the problem "how much associativity of relation composition is needed for this result". Roger

Maddux defined the class of weakly-associative relation algebra, WA, by weakening the associativity of the relation composition. István Németi showed that the equational theory of WA is decidable.

This class also can be seen as a class of relativized relation algebras. Indeed, it is proved in (Maddux, 1982) that an algebra is a WA if and only if it is isomorphic to the concrete algebra of some subrelations of a symmetric and reflexive relation. The notion of a relativized algebra has been introduced in the theory of Boolean algebras and then it was extended to algebras of logics by Leon Henkin. Relativization in algebraic logic started as a technique for generalizing representations of algebras of logics. Relativization of an algebra amounts to intersecting all its elements with a fixed set (usually a subset of the unit) and to defining the new operations as the restrictions of the old operations on this set. Relativized algebras were not really studied in their own right, but as tools to obtain results for the standard algebras. At the end of the twentieth century, Andréka, van Benthem, Monk and Németi started promoting relativized algebras as structures which are interesting independently of their classical versions, see e.g. (Henkin et al., 1981). Indeed, relativization in many cases turns the negative results into positive ones. Several relativized versions of algebras do have most of the nice properties which their standard counterparts lack.

From the universal algebra, the free algebras of a variety play an essential role in understanding this variety. They show, in some sense, the structure of the different "concepts" (represented by terms) of the variety. The intrinsic structures of the finitely generated free relativized relation algebras are very involved. Some problems concerning these algebras are still open. For example, the problem addressing the atomicity of these algebras has not been solved yet. The non-atomicity of the free algebras of logics is equivalent to weak Gödel's incompleteness property of the corresponding logic. See (Németi, 1985, proposition 8) and (Gyenis, 2011).

In the present paper, we study the atomicity of the free algebras of some interesting classes of relativized relation algebras. In particular, we give an answer for the atomicity problem of the free algebras of the class WA. This problem goes back to 1985 when I. Németi posed it in his Academic Doctoral Dissertation (Németi, 1986). In 1991, Németi posed the same problem again in (Andréka et al., 1991, Problem 38). This problem was posed again as an open problem in 2013 in the most recent book in algebraic logic (Andréka et al., 2013, Problem 1.3.3). Solving this problem, we show that the free algebras of WA generated by at least one generator are not atomic but the 0-generated free algebra of WA is finite, hence atomic.

One of the logics corresponding to relativized relation algebras is called arrow logic. It is a two-dimensional modal logic and it has various applications, e.g., in linguistics (dynamic semantics of natural language, relational semantics of Lambek Calculus), and in computer science (dynamic algebra, dynamic logic). For more about relativized relation algebras and arrow logic as modal logic see (van Benthem, 1991, 1994, 1996; Gabbay et al., 2003; Hirsch and Hodkinson, 2002; Marx et al., 1996a; Marx and Venema, 1997; Mikulás, 1993).

We need to recall some notions from universal algebra. For the definitions of these notions, one can look up any book in universal algebra (e.g., (Burris and Sankappanavar, 1981)). Let t be any algebraic type and let K be a class of algebras of type t. Let m be any cardinal. $\mathfrak{Tm}_{m,t}$ denotes the term algebra of type t generated by m-many free variables. $\mathfrak{Fr}_m K$ denotes the free algebra of the class K generated by m-many generators.

2 Interesting relativized relation algebras

Let W be an arbitrary set of ordered pairs. Set $Id^{[W]} = \{(r, s) \in W : r = s\}$. Define a unary operation ${}^{\smile[W]}$ and a binary operation $;^{[W]}$ on $\mathcal{P}(W)$ as follows. For any $R, S \subseteq W$,

$$\breve{R}^{[W]} = \{(r, s) \in W : (s, r) \in R\},$$

$$R;^{[W]} S = \{(r, s) \in W : (\exists u)(r, u) \in R \& (u, s) \in S\}.$$

When no confusion is likely, we merely omit the superscript $[W]$ from the above defined objects. A relativized relation set algebra is an algebra of the form

$$\mathfrak{A} = \langle A, \cap, \cup, \setminus, \emptyset, W, ;^{[W]}, {}^{\smile[W]}, Id^{[W]} \rangle,$$

where W is an arbitrary set of ordered pairs and $A \subseteq \mathcal{P}(W)$ is a family of subsets of W that is closed under the Boolean set theoretic operations $\cap, \cup, \setminus$, closed under the relativized operations ${}^{\smile[W]}, ;^{[W]}$ and contains the following sets $\emptyset, W, Id^{[W]}$. Suppose that U is the smallest set such that $W \subseteq U \times U$. Then W and U are called the unit and the base of $\mathfrak{A}$, respectively. The class of relativized relation set algebras is denoted by $FRA_\emptyset$. Let rl denote the algebraic type of $FRA_\emptyset$ where $1'$ denotes the constant Id called identity, its complement is denoted by $0'$ and is called diversity.

Defintion 2.1. *Let $H \subseteq \{R, S, T\}$, where R, S and T stand for "Reflexive", "Symmetric" and "Transitive" respectively. A relation is said to be an H-relation if it satisfies the properties in H. The class of H-relativized relation set algebras, FRA_H, is the subclass of $FRA_\emptyset$ which contains all of those algebras whose units are H-relations on their bases, RRA_H denotes the class of the algebras isomorphic to H-relativized representable relation set algebras.*

The notion of H-relativization with $H \subseteq \{R, S, T\}$ we use here was suggested by M. Marx. We note that $RRA_{\{R,S,T\}}$ is the class of the standard representable relation algebras. We also note that the class of the weak associative relation algebras WA coincides with the class $RRA_{\{R,S\}}$. In (Andréka, 1991), (Andréka et al., 1994), (Andréka et al., 1996), (Kramer, 1991), (Marx, 1999), (Marx et al., 1996a), (Maddux, 1982) and (Németi, 1987), it was shown that, for arbitrary $H \subseteq \{R, S, T\}$, the class RRA_H enjoys any of the following properties if and only if $T \notin H$: finite axiomatizability, decidability, finite algebra property, finite base property, weak and strong interpolation, Beth definability and super amalgamation property.

In this paper, we concentrate only on those classes RRA_H, where $H \subseteq \{S, R\}$. Our main aim is to prove that, for every $m \in \omega$ and every $H \subseteq \{R, S\}$, the m-generated free algebra of the class RRA_H is atomic if and only if $m = 0$ and $H = \{S, R\}$. We concentrate on finite numbers m only because it is known that all the infinitely-generated free RRA_H algebras are atomless.

3 Normal forms for relation type

In this section, we give a disjunctive normal form for any term in the signature of relation algebras. Disjunctive normal forms can provide elegant and constructive proofs of many standard results, c.f., (Anderson, 1954) and (Fine, 1975).

Throughout this section, we fix $m \in \omega$. For every n, we define a set $F_n^m \subseteq \mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$ of normal forms of degree n such that every member of F_n^m contains complete information about the normal forms of the smaller degrees. Then, we write up each term in $\mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$ as a disjunction of normal forms of the same degree.

We need to set up some notation and definitions. Let $n \in \omega$ and let $\tau_0, \ldots, \tau_n \in \mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$. Define $\prod_{i=0}^{0} \tau_i := \tau_0$ and inductively define $\prod_{i=0}^{k} \tau_i := (\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \tau_i) \cdot \tau_k$, for every $1 \leq k \leq n$. Let $Y \subseteq \mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$ be a finite set of terms. If $Y = \emptyset$, then define $\prod Y = 1$. Assume that $\mid Y \mid = n$, for some $n \geq 1$. Pick any bijection $f : n \rightarrowtail Y$ and let

$$\prod Y := \prod^{(f)} Y := \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} f(i).$$

This is ambiguous, but in this paper we deal with classes of Boolean algebras with operators, so it doesn't matter which bijection is taken for the above product.

Defintion 3.1. *Let $\emptyset \neq Y \subseteq \mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$ be finite and let $\alpha \in {}^{Y}\{-1, 1\}$. Define*

1. *$CY = \{x; y : x, y \in Y\} \cup \{\breve{x} : x \in Y\}$, the one-step closure of Y by the modal operations ; and $\breve{}$.*
2. *$Y^{\alpha} = \prod\{x^{\alpha} : x \in Y\}$, where for every $x \in Y$, $x^{\alpha} = x$ if $\alpha(x) = 1$ and $x^{\alpha} = -x$ if $\alpha(x) = -1$.*

Defintion 3.2. *Let $D_m = \{1', x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}\}$, where $x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}$ are the m free variables that generate $\mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$. For every $n \in \omega$, we define the followings inductively.*

- *The normal forms of degree 0, $F_0^m = \{D_m^{\beta} : \beta \in {}^{D_m}\{-1, 1\}\}$.*
- *The set of normal forms of degree $n + 1$,*

$$F_{n+1}^m = \{D_m^{\beta} \cdot (CF_n^m)^{\alpha} : \beta \in {}^{D_m}\{-1, 1\} \text{ and } \alpha \in {}^{CF_n^m}\{-1, 1\}\}.$$

- *The set of all forms, $F^m = \bigcup_{k \in \omega} F_k^m$.*

Every form in F_0^m is determined by the information telling whether it is below the identity or the diversity and whether it is below any free variable or its complement. Every form of degree $n+1$, $n \in \omega$, is determined by the same information plus information telling whether this term is below (or below the complement of) the composition of any couple of forms in F_n^m, and whether this form is below (or below the complement of) the converse of any form in F_n^m.

Let K be the class of all Boolean algebras with operators of type rl. The next theorem says that, for every $n \in \omega$, the normal forms of degree n form a partition of the unit (inside K). It also indicates that every term in $\mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$ can be rewritten in the form of disjunctions of some normal forms of the same degree.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $n \in \omega$. Then the followings are true:*

(i). $K \models \sum F_n^m = 1$.

(ii). *For every $\tau, \sigma \in F_n^m$, if $\tau \neq \sigma$ then $K \models \tau \cdot \sigma = 0$.*

(iii). *There exists an effective method to find, for every $\tau \in F_n^m$, a finite $S \subseteq F_{n+1}^m$ such that $K \models \tau = \sum S$.*

(iv). *There exists an effective method to find, for every $\tau \in \mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$, an $k \in \omega$ and a finite $S_\tau \subseteq F_k^m$ such that $K \models \tau = \sum S_\tau$.*

Proof.

(i). Since the Boolean reduct of every member of K is Boolean algebra, we have $(\forall S \subseteq \mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl})K \models \Sigma\{S^\beta : \beta \in {}^S\{-1,1\}\} = 1$. In particular, for every $n \geq 1$, we should have

$$\begin{aligned} K \models \Sigma F_0^m &= \Sigma\{D_m^\alpha : \alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}\} = 1, \text{ and} \\ K \models \Sigma F_n^m &= \Sigma\{D_m^\alpha \cdot \Sigma\{C(F_{n-1}^\beta) : \beta \in {}^{F_{n-1}^m}\{-1,1\}\} : \alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}\} \\ &= \Sigma\{D_m^\alpha : \alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}\} \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

(ii). Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}$ be such that $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$. Then there exists $x \in D_m$ such that, without loss of generality, $\alpha_1(x) = 1$ and $\alpha_2(x) = -1$. Therefore, $K \models D_m^{\alpha_1} \leq x$, $K \models D_m^{\alpha_2} \leq -x$ and $K \models D_m^{\alpha_1} \cdot D_m^{\alpha_2} = 0$. Let $n \geq 1$, and let $\tau, \sigma \in F_n^m$. Similarly, if $\tau \neq \sigma$, then without loss of generality we can assume that there exists $y \in D_m \cup CF_{n-1}^m$ such that $K \models \tau \leq y$ and $K \models \sigma \leq -y$. Therefore, $K \models \tau \cdot \sigma = 0$, as desired.

(iii). For every $\alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}$, we have $K \models D_m^\alpha = \Sigma\{D_m^\alpha \cdot (CF_0^m)^\beta : \beta \in {}^{F_0^m}\{-1,1\}\}$. Inductively, let $n \geq 1$ and assume that for every $\sigma \in F_{n-1}^m$ there exists $S_\sigma \subseteq F_n^m$ such that $K \models \sigma = \Sigma S_\sigma$. For every $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in F_{n-1}^m$, define $S_{\sigma_1;\sigma_2} = \{\gamma_1;\gamma_2 : \gamma_1 \in S_{\sigma_1} \text{ and } \gamma_2 \in S_{\sigma_2}\}$ and $S_{\breve{\sigma}_1} = \{\breve{\gamma} : \gamma \in S_{\sigma_1}\}$.

Let $\tau = D^{\alpha}_{m} \cdot (CF^{m}_{n-1})^{\beta} \in F^{m}_{n}$. For every $\beta^{'} \in {}^{CF^{m}_{n}}\{-1,1\}$, we say that $\beta^{'}$ is compatible with β, in symbols $\beta^{'} \sim \beta$, if for every $\sigma \in CF^{m}_{n-1}$,

$$\beta(\sigma) = 1 \iff (\exists \gamma \in S_{\sigma})\beta^{'}(\gamma) = 1.$$

Let $S_{\tau} = \{D^{\alpha}_{m} \cdot (CF^{m}_{n})^{\beta^{'}} : \beta^{'} \in {}^{CF^{m}_{n}}\{-1,1\}, \beta^{'} \sim \beta\} \subseteq F^{m}_{n+1}$. Recall that K is a class of Boolean algebras with operators, therefore $K \models \tau = \Sigma S_{\tau}$.

(iv). By induction on terms. For every $\tau \in D_m$, we have

$$K \models \tau = \Sigma\{D^{\alpha}_{m} : \alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}, \alpha(\tau) = 1\}.$$

Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \mathfrak{Tm}_{m,rl}$ be such that there is an effective method to find n_1, n_2 and finite $S_1 \subseteq F^{m}_{n_1}$ and $S_2 \subseteq F^{m}_{n_2}$ such that $K \models \sigma_1 = \Sigma S_1$ and $K \models \sigma_2 = \Sigma S_2$. By item (iii) we may assume that $n_1 = n_2 =: n$.

- If $\tau = \sigma_1 + \sigma_2$ then $K \models \tau = \Sigma(S_1 \cup S_2)$.
- If $\tau = \sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2$ then $K \models \tau = \Sigma\{x \cdot y : x \in S_1, y \in S_2\}$. By item (ii), it is clear that $\{x \cdot y : x \in S_1, y \in S_2\} \subseteq F^{m}_{n}$.
- If $\tau = -\sigma_1$, then $K \models \tau = \Sigma(F^{m}_{n} \setminus S_1)$.
- If $\tau = \sigma_1; \sigma_2$ then, for every $w \in S := \{y; z : y \in S_1, z \in S_2\}$, let

  $$S_w = \{D^{\alpha}_{m} \cdot (CF^{m}_{n})^{\beta} : \alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}, \beta \in {}^{F^{m}_{n}}\{-1,1\}, \beta(w) = 1\}.$$

  Therefore, $K \models \tau = \Sigma \bigcup \{S_w : w \in S\}$.
- If $\tau = \breve{\sigma}_1$ then, for every $w \in S := \{\breve{y} : y \in S_1\}$, let

  $$S_w = \{D^{\alpha}_{m} \cdot (CF^{m}_{n})^{\beta} : \alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}, \beta \in {}^{F^{m}_{n}}\{-1,1\}, \beta(w) = 1\}.$$

  Therefore, $K \models \tau = \Sigma \bigcup \{S_w : w \in S\}$.

□

Back to the relativized relation algebras. Let $k \in \omega$. Theorem 3.1 ((i), (ii)) can also be used to label the elements of the unit of any relativized relation algebra with normal forms from F^{m}_{k}. Let $\mathfrak{A} \in RRA_{\emptyset}$ and ev be some evaluation of $x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}$ into A. Suppose that V is the unit of $\mathfrak{A}$. Let $(r,s) \in V$, define $D^{\mathfrak{A},\iota}_{k}(r,s) := \tau$, where τ is the unique form in F^{m}_{k} such that $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota, (r,s)) \models \tau$, where, for every term σ, we write $(\mathfrak{A}, ev, (r,s)) \models \sigma$ if and only if $(r,s) \in [\sigma]^{\mathfrak{A}}_{v}$.

Remark 3.1. *Suppose that $k \geq 1$. Let $(r,s) \in V$ and suppose that U is the base of $\mathfrak{A}$. Note that, in order to determine the normal form in F^{m}_{k} that (r,s) satisfies in $(\mathfrak{A}, \iota)$, it is necessary and sufficient to determine the terms from F^{m}_{k-1} which the neighbors of (r,s) satisfy, where the neighbors of (r,s) is defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} nghbr(r,s) = \quad & \{(r,s),(s,r),(r,r),(s,s)\} \cap V \\ \cup \quad & \{(x,w) : (w,y) \in V, w \in U, \{x,y\} \subseteq \{r,s\}\} \\ \cup \quad & \{(w,y) : (x,w) \in V, w \in U, \{x,y\} \subseteq \{r,s\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This is so by the definition of normal forms. Indeed, every normal form was determined by the information on the forms of the first smaller degree.

The following definition focuses on how to obtain the information that the normal forms carry from their syntactical construction.

Defintion 3.3. *Define* $color_m : F^m \to F^m$ *as follows. For every* $k \in \omega$*, every* $\beta \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}$ *and every* $\alpha \in {}^{CF_k}\{-1,1\}$*, define*

$$color_m(D_m^\beta \cdot (CF_k)^\alpha) = color_m(D_m^\beta) = \{y \in D_m : \beta(y) = 1\}.$$

For every term $\tau \in F^m$, τ is said to be white if $1^{'} \in color_m(\tau)$ and is said to be black otherwise.

Defintion 3.4. *Define* $sub_m : F^m \to \mathcal{P}({}^2F_k^m)$ *as follows:*

1. *For every* $\tau \in F_0^m$, $sub_m(\tau) = \emptyset$.
2. *Let* $k \in \omega$, $\beta \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}$, $\alpha \in {}^{CF_k^m}\{-1,1\}$ *and* $\tau = D_m^\beta \cdot (CF_k^m)^\alpha \in F_{k+1}^m$. *Define* $sub_m(\tau) = \{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in {}^2F_k^m : \beta(\sigma_1; \sigma_2) = 1\}$.

Defintion 3.5. *Define the following partial functions* $f_m, R_m, L_m : F^m \to F^m$ *as follows:*

1. *For every* $\tau \in F_0^m$, $\tau \notin dom(f_m) \cup dom(R_m) \cup dom(L_m)$.
2. *Let* $k \in \omega$, $\beta \in {}^{D_m}\{-1,1\}$, $\alpha \in {}^{CF_k^m}\{-1,1\}$ *and* $\tau = D_m^\beta \cdot (CF_k^m)^\alpha \in F_{k+1}^m$.
   (a) *If there exists a unique* $\sigma \in F_k^m$ *such that* $\alpha(\breve{\sigma}) = 1$ *then* $\tau \in dom(f_m)$ *and* $f_m(\tau) = \sigma$. *Otherwise,* $\tau \notin dom(f_m)$.
   (b) *If there exists a unique white* $\lambda \in F_k^m$ *such that* $\alpha(\sigma; \lambda) = 1$ *for some* $\sigma \in F_k^m$ *then* $\tau \in dom(R_m)$ *and* $R_m(\tau) = \lambda$. *Otherwise,* $\tau \notin dom(R_m)$.
   (c) *If there exists a unique white* $\lambda \in F_k^m$ *such that* $\alpha(\lambda; \sigma) = 1$ *for some* $\sigma \in F_k^m$ *then* $\tau \in dom(L_m)$ *and* $L_m(\tau) = \lambda$. *Otherwise,* $\tau \notin dom(L_m)$.

4 The atomicity of the free relativized relation algebras

Throughout this section, let $m \in \omega$ and $H \subseteq \{R, S\}$ be arbitrary but fixed. Recall that we are searching for the atoms in $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$. By theorem 3.1 ((iv)), it is enough to search for the atoms among the normal forms. Our main aim is to prove the following.

Theorem 4.1. $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$ *is atomic if and only if* $m = 0$ *and* $H = \{R, S\}$.

We prove some propositions considering some special cases of the above theorem. The next proposition proves one direction of theorem 4.1.

Ptoposition 4.1. *The free algebra $\mathfrak{Fr}_0RRA_{\{R,S\}}$ is finite, hence atomic.*

Proof. Let $H = \{R, S\}$ and let $Y = \{e_1, e_2, m_2, m_3\}$, where

$$e_1 = 1' \cdot -(0';0'), \qquad e_2 = 1' \cdot (0';0'),$$
$$m_2 = 0' \cdot -(0';0'), \qquad m_3 = 0' \cdot (0';0').$$

Clearly, for every $\tau \in F_1^0$ there exists $\sigma \in Y$ such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_0RRA_H \models \tau = \sigma$. It is easy to check the following.

$$\breve{e_1} = e_1, \breve{e_2} = e_2, \breve{m_2} = m_2 \text{ and } \breve{m_3} = m_3.$$

Also, in $\mathfrak{Fr}_0RRA_H$ we have

;	e_1	e_2	m_2	m_3
e_1	e_1	0	0	0
e_2	0	e_2	m_2	m_3
m_2	0	m_2	0	0
m_3	0	m_3	0	$e_2 + m_3$

Therefore, for every $\tau \in F^0$ there exists $\sigma \in Y$ such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_0RRA_H \models \tau = \sigma$. Hence, theorem 3.1, (iv), implies that $\mathfrak{Fr}_0RRA_H$ is $+$ generated by $\{e_1, e_2, m_2, m_3\}$. Hence $\mathfrak{Fr}_0RRA_H$ is finite, and consequently atomic. In fact, Y is the set of atoms of $\mathfrak{Fr}_0RRA_H$, thus the above give a complete description of this free algebra. □

To prove the other direction of the theorem, suppose that $H \neq \{R, S\}$ or $m > 0$. Let $t = 0' \cdot \breve{0'} \cdot ((0' \cdot \breve{0'}); (0' \cdot \breve{0'}))$, we show that there is no atom below t in $\mathfrak{Fr}_mRRA_H$. To this end, fix a finite number $q \geq 1$ and a satisfiable normal form $\tau \in F_q^m$ such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_mRRA_H \models 0 \neq \tau \leq t$. Our strategy goes through the following steps.

Step 1 Construct an algebra $\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H} \in RRA_H$ and an evaluation $\iota^{\tau,H}$.

Step 2 Prove that $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H})$ witnesses the satisfiability of the form τ.

Step 3 Select a special sequence of edges $e_q, \ldots, e_0 \in E^{\tau,H}$ such that $l^{\tau,H}(e_q) = \tau$.

Step 4 Use this sequence to extend $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H})$ to $(\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H}, \iota_+^{\tau,H})$.

Step 5 Prove that every element of the above sequence satisfies a term in $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H})$ and another one in $(\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H}, \iota_+^{\tau,H})$ such that both of them are disjoint and each of which is below its labels.

Hence the labels of the sequence selected in Step 2 are not atoms in $\mathfrak{Fr}_mRRA_H$. Therefore, τ is not an atom in $\mathfrak{Fr}_mRRA_H$.

Step 1: We first construct a graph G^τ that acts as the unit of $\mathfrak{G}^\tau$. The construction of G^τ goes through countably many rounds. At round $n \in \omega$, we construct a graph $G_n = (V_n, E_n)$ with a labeling function $l_n : E_n \to \bigcup\{F_j^m : 0 \leq j \leq q\}$ and with a depth function $d_n : E_n \cup Id_{V_n} \to \{0, \ldots, q\}$. To achieve our purpose, we require our constructed graphs to obey the following "consistency" conditions. For every $n \in \omega$ and every $u, v, w \in V_n$ such that $(u, v) \in E_n$ and $d_n(u, v) = k$ for some $k \leq q$, we have the followings.

(1). E_n is an H-relation on V, $V_n \subseteq V_{n+1}$, $E_n \subseteq E_{n+1}$, $l_n \subseteq l_{n+1}$ and $d_n \subseteq d_{n+1}$.

(2). $l_n(u, v) \in F_k^m$ and $1' \in color_m(l_n(u, v))$ if and only if $u = v$.

(3). If $(v, u) \in E_n$ then $d_n(v, u) \in \{k - 1, k, k + 1\}$.

(4). $d_n(u, u) \in \{k - 1, k, k + 1\}$ and $d_n(v, v) \in \{k - 1, k, k + 1\}$.

(5). If $\{(u, w), (w, v)\} \subseteq E_n$, then $\{d_n(u, w), d_n(w, v)\} \subseteq \{k - 1, k, k + 1\}$.

(6). Suppose that $k \geq 1$, $(v, u) \in E_n$ and $d_n(v, u) = k - 1$. Then either $d_n(u, u) = k$ and $d_n(v, v) = k - 1$, or, $d_n(u, u) = k - 1$ and $d_n(v, v) = k$.

(7). Suppose that $(v, u) \notin E_n$ or $(v, u) \in E_n$ but $d_n(v, u) = k$. Then either $d_n(u, u) \neq k + 1$ or $d_n(v, v) \neq k + 1$.

(8). If $\{(u, w), (w, v)\} \subseteq E_n$, then $\mathfrak{Fr}_m WA \models l_n(u, v) \cdot (l_n(u, w); l_n(w, v)) \neq 0$.

(9). $RRA_H \models J(u, v) := \zeta(u, v) \cdot \zeta(u, u) \cdot \zeta(v, v) \neq 0$. Where $\zeta(u, v)$, $\zeta(u, u)$ and $\zeta(v, v)$ are given as follows. If $(v, u) \in E_n$ then $\zeta(u, v) = l_n(u, v) \cdot l_n(v, u)\breve{}$, otherwise $\zeta(u, v) = l_n(u, v) \cdot -1\breve{}$. If $(u, u) \in E_n$ then $\zeta(u, u) = l_n(u, u); l_n(u, v)$, otherwise $\zeta(u, u) = -(1'; l_n(u, v))$. If $(v, v) \in E_n$ then $\zeta(v, v) = l_n(u, v); l_n(v, v)$, otherwise $\zeta(v, v) = -(l_n(u, v); 1')$.

Conditions ((2)), ((3)), ((4)) and ((5)) are used to show that the edges carry labels that don't interrupt the desired consistency in the sense of remark 3.1. We construct the graph G^τ inductively, conditions ((6)) and ((7)) are used for the induction step together with conditions ((8)) and ((9)) which allow us to give labels of the degrees we need in a consistent way with our purpose as we shall see.

For constructing G_0, pick two different nodes u, v. Define, $V_0 = \{u, v\}$ and $E_0 = \{(u, v), (v, u)\} \cup \{(u, u) : \tau \in dom(L_m)\} \cup \{(v, v) : \tau \in dom(R_m)\}$. Define, $d_0(u, v) = d_0^{\tau,H}(u, u) = q$ and $d_0(v, u) = d_0(v, v) = q - 1$. Remember that τ is satisfiable form, then there exists an algebra $\mathfrak{B} \in RRA_H$, an evaluation ι and (r, s) in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$ such that $(\mathfrak{B}, \iota, (r, s)) \models \tau$. Define, $l_0^{\tau,H}(u, v) = \tau$, $l_0^{\tau,H}(v, u) = f_m(\tau)$, $l_0^{\tau,H}(u, u) = D_q^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(r, s)$ only if $\tau \in dom(L_m)$ and $l_0^{\tau,H}(v, v) = R_m(\tau)$ only if $\tau \in dom(R_m)$. We note that $f_m(\tau)$ exists because $RRA_H \models 0 \neq \tau \leq t$.

We have to check that G_0 satisfies the consistency conditions. Here, only conditions ((8)), ((9)) need a little thought: they are satisfied because τ is

a nonzero normal form and the labels are given by the algebra $\mathfrak{B}$ and the evaluation ι. We need to extend our piece of $G^{\tau,H}$ in a way that guarantees that (u, v) satisfies τ at the end of the construction. Whence, we need to add decompositions for all the edges according to the information given by sub_m of their labels. We don't care about any other information because our strategy goes as follows. Simultaneously with constructing a new edge, we add its converse and its loops according to the information given by $f_m(\tau)$, $L_m(\tau)$ and $R_m(\tau)$.

More generally, let $n \in \omega$ and suppose that $G_n = (V_n, E_n), l_n, d_n$ have been constructed. In the round $n+1$, let $W_n = \{e \in E_n : d_n(e) \geq 1$, and, $e \notin E_{n-1}$ if $n \geq 1\}$, i.e, the set of the edges that we have to consider the information given by the black couples in their $sub'_m s$. Let $Y_n = \{(a, b) \in W_n : (b, a) \notin E_n$, or, $(b, a) \in E_n$ and $d_n(a, b) \geq d_n(b, a)\}$. In fact, for every edge $(a, b) \in W_n \setminus Y_n$, we don't need to consider the black forms $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in sub_m(l_n(a, b)) \cap {}^2dom(f_m)$. Indeed, $(b, a) \in Y_n$ and we add edges according to the information given by $sub_m(l_n(b, a))$. The converses of some of these newly added edges are also added and they are enough to carry the information given by $sub_m(l_n(a, b))$. Let U be an infinite set disjoint from V_n. For every $e \in Y_n$, create an injective function

$$g_e : \{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in sub_m(l_n(e)) : \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \text{ are both black}\} \to U,$$

and for every $e \in W_n \setminus Y_n$, create an injective function

$$g_e : \{(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in sub_m(l_n(e)) \setminus {}^2dom(f_m) : \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \text{ are both black}\} \to U,$$

such that the ranges of the functions g_e's are pairwise disjoint. Let $e = (a, b) \in W_n$ and let $w \in Rng(g_e)$. Then there exists a pair of black forms $(\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in sub_m(l_n(e)) \cap dom(g_e)$ such that $g_e((\sigma_1, \sigma_2)) = w$. Remember that G_n satisfies the consistency condition ((8)). Therefore, there exists an algebra $\mathfrak{B} \in RRA_H$, an evaluation ι and (r, s) in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$ such that $(\mathfrak{B}, \iota, (r, s)) \models l_n^{\tau,H}(e)$. Since both σ_1, σ_2 are black, then there exists p in the base of $\mathfrak{B}$ different from r and s such that $(r, p), (p, s)$ are in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$, $(\mathfrak{B}, \iota, (r, p)) \models \sigma_1$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \iota, (p, s)) \models \sigma_2$. If $S \in H$, then $(p, r), (s, p)$ are both in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$. If $R \in H$, then (p, p) is in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$. If $\sigma_1 \in dom(f_m)$, then (p, r) is in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \iota, (p, r)) \models f_m(\sigma_1)$. If $\sigma_2 \in dom(f_m)$, then (s, p) is in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \iota, (s, p)) \models f_m(\sigma_2)$. If $\sigma_1 \in dom(R_m)$ (hence $\sigma_2 \in dom(L_m)$), then (p, p) is in the unit of $\mathfrak{B}$ and $(\mathfrak{B}, \iota, (p, p)) \models R_m(\sigma_1)(= L_m(\sigma_2))$. Suppose that $d_n(e) = k$, for some $k \geq 1$.

Case 1 Suppose that $(b, a) \in E_n$ and $d_n(b, a) = k-1$. We define E_w as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E_w : \quad = \quad & \{(a, w), (w, b)\} \\ & \cup\{(w, a) : \sigma_1 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H\} \\ & \cup\{(b, w) : \sigma_2 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H\} \\ & \cup\{(w, w) : \sigma_1 \in dom(L_m) \text{ or } R \in H\}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $d_n(a,a) = k$ and $d_n(b,b) = k-1$. Define,

$$l_w(a,w) = \sigma_1,\ l_w(w,b) = \sigma_2,$$

$$l_w(w,a) = \begin{cases} D^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}_{k-1}(p,r) & \sigma_1 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H \\ \text{not defined} & otherwise, \end{cases}$$

$$l_w(b,w) = \begin{cases} f_m(\sigma_2) & \sigma_2 \in dom(f_m) \\ D^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}_{0}(s,p) & \sigma_2 \notin dom(f_m) \text{ and } S \in H \text{ and} \\ \text{not defined} & otherwise, \end{cases}$$

$$l_w(w,w) = \begin{cases} L_m(\sigma_1) & \sigma_1 \in dom(L_m) \\ D^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}_{0}(p,p) & \sigma_1 \notin dom(L_m) \text{ and } R \in H \\ \text{not defined} & otherwise. \end{cases}$$

For the other case when $d_n(a,a) = k-1$ and $d_n(b,b) = k$, we define E_w and l_w in a symmetric way to above. For the depths, define $d_w(w,w) = k-2$,if $k \geq 2$, and $d_w(w,w) = 0$ otherwise. For every edge $e \in E_w$, $d_w(e)$ is defined to be the degree of the normal form $l_w(e)$.



Figure 1: Case 1

Case 2 Suppose that $(b,a) \notin E_n$, or, $(b,a) \in E_n$ and $d_n(b,a) \geq k$. We have one of the following cases.

(i) Suppose that $d_n(a,a) \neq k+1$ and $d_n(b,b) \neq k+1$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} E_w : &= \{(a,w),(w,b)\} \\ &\cup\{(w,a) : \sigma_1 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H\} \\ &\cup\{(b,w) : \sigma_2 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H\} \\ &\cup\{(w,w) : \sigma_1 \in dom(L_m) \text{ or } R \in H\}. \end{aligned}$$

We define l_w as follows: $l_w(a,w) = \sigma_1, l_w(w,b) = \sigma_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} l_w(w,a) &= D_{k-1}^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(p,r) \text{ if and only if } \sigma_1 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H, \\ l_w(b,w) &= D_{k-1}^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(s,p) \text{ if and only if } \sigma_2 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H, \textit{and}, \\ l_w(w,w) &= \begin{cases} L_m(\sigma_1) & \sigma_1 \in dom(L_m) \\ D_0^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(p,p) & \sigma_1 \notin dom(L_m) \text{ and } R \in H \\ \text{not defined} & \textit{otherwise}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Define $d_w(w,w) = k-2$, if $k \geq 2$, and $d_w(w,w) = 0$ otherwise. For every edge $e \in E_w$, define $d_w(e)$ is defined to be the degree of the normal form $l_w(e)$.

(ii) Suppose that $d_n(a,a) = k+1$, then $d_n(b,b) \neq k+1$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} E_w : &= \{(a,w),(w,b)\} \\ &\cup\{(w,a) : D_k^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(p,r) \in dom(f_m)\} \\ &\cup\{(b,w) : \sigma_2 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H\} \\ &\cup\{(w,w) : D_k^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(p,r) \in dom(L_m) \text{ or } R \in H\}. \end{aligned}$$

Define, $l_w(a,w) = D_k^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(r,p)$, $l_w(w,b) = \sigma_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} l_w(w,a) &= D_k^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(p,r) \text{ if and only if } D_k^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(r,p) \in dom(f_m) \\ l_w(b,w) &= D_{k-1}^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(s,p) \text{ if and only if } \sigma_2 \in dom(f_m) \text{ or } S \in H, \textit{and}, \\ l_w(w,w) &= L_m(D_k^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(r,p)) \text{ if and only if } D_k^{\mathfrak{B},\iota}(r,p) \in dom(L_m). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for the case $d_n(b,b) = k+1$, we define E_w and l_w in the same spirt of the above item. Define $d_w(w,w) = k-1$ and, for every edge $e \in E_w$, $d_w(e)$ is defined as expected.

Define the graph $G_{n+1} := (V_{n+1}, E_{n+1})$, the labeling l_{n+1} and the depth d_{n+1} as follows.

$$V_{n+1} = V_n \cup \bigcup\{Rng(g_e) : e \in W_n\}, \quad E_{n+1} = E_n \cup \bigcup\{E_w : w \in V_{n+1} \setminus V_n\},$$
$$l_{n+1} = l_n \cup \bigcup\{l_w : w \in V_{n+1} \setminus V_n\}, \quad d_{n+1} = d_n \cup \bigcup\{d_w : w \in V_{n+1} \setminus V_n\}.$$

Note that, the special choices of the labels and the depths of the new edges guarantee that G_{n+1} is subjected to the consistency conditions listed above.

In fact, we used the assumption that G_n satisfies these conditions to get some algebras which satisfy some pieces of G_n then we used these algebras to label the extra edges added to these pieces to get G_{n+1} satisfying the required conditions. We continue building the graph $G^{\tau,H}$ following the same argument by considering the information given by sub_m of the labels of the edges. So $G^{\tau,H}$ is constructed, basically, by knitting particular pieces of some members of RRA_H and by assigning compatible depths caring remark 3.1. This is what we targeted by the consistency conditions. We note that these choices of the depths are not the only possible choices, but with these choices we could reach our aim. Also, one may notice that the depths of the loops are the keys we use to follow remark 3.1. We note that the resulting graph might be infinite independently from the choices of the depths.

Let $G^{\tau,H} = (V^{\tau,H}, E^{\tau,H})$, where $V^{\tau,H} := \bigcup\{V_n : n \in \omega\}$ and $E^{\tau,H} := \bigcup\{E_n : n \in \omega\}$. We still need the depths and the labels, let $d^{\tau,H} = \bigcup\{d_n : n \in \omega\}$ and $l^{\tau,H} = \bigcup\{l_n : n \in \omega\}$. Now, define $\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}$ as the full RRA_H algebra with unit $E^{\tau,H}$,

$$\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H} = \langle \mathcal{P}(E^{\tau,H}), \cap, \cup, \setminus, \emptyset, E^{\tau,H}, ;^{[E^{\tau,H}]}, {}^{\smile[E^{\tau,H}]} \rangle.$$

By the consistency conditions (1), every E_n is an H-relation on V_n. Consequently, $\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H} \in RRA_H$ as desired. Define an evaluation of the free variables $x_0, \ldots, x_{m-1}$ as follows. For every $i < m$, define $\iota^{\tau,H}(x_i) = \{e \in E^{\tau,H} : x_i \in color_m(l^{\tau,H}(e))\}$. Now, we need to prove the following proposition.

Step 2: In the next proposition, we prove that every edge in E^{τ} satisfies its label in $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H})$. Therefore, in particular, The unique edge (u, v) satisfies τ in $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H})$.

Ptoposition 4.2. *For every edge $e \in E^{\tau,H}$, $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models l^{\tau,H}(e)$.*

Proof. We make use of the consistency conditions ((2))-((9)). Let $e = (e_0, e_1) \in E^{\tau,H}$. Then, by condition ((9)), we have $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models l^{\tau,H}(e) \neq 0$. For every $0 \leq k \leq d^{\tau,H}(e)$, let $tag_k^{\tau,H}(e)$ be the unique term in F_k^m such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models l^{\tau,H}(e) \leq tag_k^{\tau,H}(e)$. For every $d^{\tau,H}(e) \leq k \leq q$, let $tag_k^{\tau,H}(e) := l^{\tau,H}(e)$. It suffices to prove that

$$(\forall e \in E^{\tau,H})\ (\forall 0 \leq k \leq q) \quad (\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models tag_k^{\tau,H}(e). \qquad (*)$$

For this, we use induction on k. Condition ((2)) and the special choice of $\iota^{\tau,H}$ ensure that $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models tag_0^{\tau,H}(e)$, for every $e \in E^{\tau,H}$. Suppose that, for some $0 \leq k \leq q-1$, $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models tag_k^{\tau,H}(e)$ for every $e \in E^{\tau,H}$. Let $(e_0, e_1) \in E^{\tau,H}$, if $k \geq d^{\tau,H}(e)$ then $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models tag_{k+1}^{\tau,H}(e) = tag_k^{\tau,H}(e) = l^{\tau,H}(e)$. So, we can assume that $k < d^{\tau,H}(e)$ (then $j := d^{\tau,H}(e) \geq 1$). Let $\alpha \in {}^{D_m}\{-1, 1\}$, $\beta \in {}^{CF_k^m}\{-1, 1\}$ and $\beta' \in {}^{CF_{j-1}^m}\{-1, 1\}$ be such that

$$tag_{k+1}^{\tau,H}(e) := D_m^{\alpha} \cdot (CF_k^m)^{\beta} \text{ and } \sigma := D_m^{\alpha} \cdot (CF_{j-1}^m)^{\beta'}.$$

By condition ((2)) and the special choice of the evaluation $\iota^{\tau,H}$, we have

$$(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models D_m^{\alpha}. \tag{1}$$

Let $\gamma \in F_k^m$. Suppose that $\beta(\breve{\gamma}) = 1$. Then there exists $\gamma_1 \in F_{j-1}^m$ such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_1 \leq \gamma$ and $\beta^{'}(\breve{\gamma_1}) = 1$, i.e., $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot \breve{\gamma_1} \neq 0$. By conditions ((9)) and ((3)), there exists $l \geq j-1$, $\gamma_2 \in F_l^m$ and an edge such that $(e_1, e_0) \in E^{\tau,H}$, $l^{\tau,H}(e_1, e_0) = \gamma_2$ and $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot \breve{\gamma_2} \neq 0$. Let γ_3 be the unique term in F_{j-1}^m such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_2 \leq \gamma_3$. Hence, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot \breve{\gamma_3} \neq 0$ and, consequently, $\beta^{'}(\breve{\gamma_3}) = 1$. Recall that $\beta^{'}(\breve{\gamma_1}) = 1$, then $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot (\gamma_3 \cdot \gamma_1)^{\smile} = \sigma \cdot \breve{\gamma_3} \cdot \breve{\gamma_1} \neq 0$. By theorem 3.1, (ii), this happens only if $\gamma_1 = \gamma_3$. Hence, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1$. By induction hypothesis, we have $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (e_1, e_0)) \models tag_k^{\tau,H}((e_1, e_0)) = \gamma$. Therefore, $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \breve{\gamma}$. Conversely, suppose that $\beta(\breve{\gamma}) = -1$. Assume toward a contradiction that there exist $l \geq j-1$, $\gamma_1 \in F_l^m$ such that $(e_1, e_0) \in E^{\tau,H}$, $l^{\tau,H}(e_1, e_0) = \gamma_1$ and $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (e_1, e_0)) \models \gamma$. By the induction hypothesis and theorem 3.1, (ii), we should have $tag_k^{\tau,H}((e_1, e_0)) = \gamma$. By condition ((9)), $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot \breve{\gamma_1} \neq 0$. Hence, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models tag_{k+1}^{\tau,H}(e) \cdot \breve{\gamma} \neq 0$, which makes a contradiction. Therefore,

$$(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \breve{\gamma} \iff \beta(\breve{\gamma}) = 1. \tag{2}$$

Let $\lambda \in F_k^m$ be a white term and $\gamma \in F_k^m$ be a black term. Suppose that $\beta(\lambda; \gamma) = 1$. Then there exist a white $\lambda_1 \in F_{j-1}^m$ and a black $\gamma_1 \in F_{j-1}^m$ such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \lambda_1 \leq \lambda$, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_1 \leq \gamma$ and $\beta^{'}(\lambda_1; \gamma_1) = 1$. Hence, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot (\lambda_1; \gamma_1) \neq 0$. But $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \lambda_1; \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_1$, then $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \leq \gamma_1$ and $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot (\lambda_1; \sigma) \neq 0$. By conditions ((9)) and ((4)) there exist $l \geq j-1 \geq k$ and $\lambda_2 \in F_l^m$ such that $(e_0, e_0) \in E^{\tau,H}$, $l^{\tau,H}(e_0, e_0) = \lambda_2$ and $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \lambda_2; \sigma \neq 0$. Let λ_3 be the unique term in F_{j-1}^m such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_3$. Hence, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \lambda_3; \gamma_1 \neq 0$ and $\beta^{'}(\lambda_3; \gamma_1) = 1$. Recall that $\beta^{'}(\lambda_1; \gamma_1) = 1$, then $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models (\lambda_1; \gamma_1) \cdot (\lambda_3; \gamma_1) = (\lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_3) \cdot \gamma_1 \neq 0$. By theorem 3.1, (ii), this means that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3$ and $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1$. By induction, we have $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, ((e_0, e_0))) \models tag_k^{\tau,H}((e_0, e_0)) = \lambda$ and $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \gamma$. Therefore, $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \lambda; \gamma$. Conversely, suppose that $\beta(\lambda; \gamma) = -1$ and $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \gamma$. Assume toward a contradiction that there exist $l \geq j-1$, $\lambda_1 \in F_l^m$ such that $(e_0, e_0) \in E^{\tau,H}$, $l^{\tau,H}(e_0, e_0) = \lambda_1$ and $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (e_0, e_0)) \models \lambda$. By the induction hypothesis and theorem 3.1, (ii), we should have $tag_k^{\tau,H}((e_0, e_0)) = \lambda$. By condition ((9)), $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \sigma \cdot (\lambda_1; \sigma) \neq 0$. Hence, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models tag_{k+1}^{\tau,H}(e) \cdot (\lambda; \gamma) \neq 0$, which makes a contradiction. Therefore,

$$(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \lambda; \gamma \iff \beta(\lambda; \gamma) = 1. \tag{3}$$

Similarly,

$$(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \gamma; \lambda \iff \beta(\gamma; \lambda) = 1. \tag{4}$$

Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in F_k^m$ be black terms. Suppose that $\beta(\gamma_1; \gamma_2) = 1$, then there exists $\gamma_1^{'}, \gamma_2^{'} \in F_{j-1}^m$ such that $\beta^{'}(\gamma_1^{'}; \gamma_2^{'}) = 1$, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_1^{'} \leq \gamma_1$ and

$\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_2^{'} \leq \gamma_2$. By the construction and condition ((5)), there exist a node $w \in g_e$, $j_1, j_2 \geq l-1$ and $\gamma_1^{''} \in F_{j_1}^m$ and $\gamma_2^{''} \in F_{j_2}^m$ such that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_1^{''} \leq \gamma_1^{'}$, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \gamma_2^{''} \leq \gamma_2^{'}$, both $(e_0, w), (w, e_1)$ are edges in $E_{n+1}^{\tau,H}$, $l^{\tau,H}(e_0, w) = \gamma_1^{''}$ and $l^{\tau,H}(w, e_1) = \gamma_2^{''}$. By induction, we have $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (e_0, w)) \models tag_k^{\tau,H}((e_0, w)) = \gamma_1$ and $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (w, e_1)) \models tag_k^{\tau,H}((w, e_1)) = \gamma_2$. Therefore, $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models \gamma_1; \gamma_2$. Conversely, Suppose that $\beta(\gamma_1; \gamma_2) = -1$ and assume toward a contradiction that there exists a node $w \in V^{\tau,H}$, $j_1, j_2 \geq l-1$ and $\gamma_1^{'} \in F_{j_1}^m$ and $\gamma_2^{'} \in F_{j_2}^m$ such that both $(e_0, w), (w, e_1) \in E^{\tau,H}$, $l^{\tau,H}(e_0, w) = \gamma_1^{'}$, $l^{\tau,H}(w, e_1) = \gamma_2^{'}$, $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (e_0, w)) \models \gamma_1$ and $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (w, e_1)) \models \gamma_2$. By a similar argument, using condition ((8)), one can show a contradiction. Therefore,

$$(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^c, e) \models \gamma_1; \gamma_2 \iff \beta(\gamma_1; \gamma_2) = 1. \tag{5}$$

By (1), (2), (3), (4) and (5), it follows that $(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e) \models tag_{k+1}^{\tau,H}(e)$, as desired. □

The algebra $\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}$ and the evaluation $\iota^{\tau,H}$ have been constructed and were shown to witness satisfiability of τ. Now, we carry on with our plan and move to the next step.

Step 3: We need to find a sequence (zigzag!) of special edges.

Defintion 4.1. *An edge $(a, b) \in E^{\tau,H}$ is said to be*

- *a useful edge if $(b, a) \in E^{\tau,H}$, $d^{\tau,H}(b, a) < d(a, b)$, and either (a, b) is the unique edge in $E^{\tau,H}$ whose depth is q and $a \neq b$, or, there exists a unique node $w \in V^{\tau,H}$ such that $\{(a, w), (w, b), (w, a), (b, w)\} \subseteq E^{\tau,H}$ and $d^{\tau,H}(a, w)$, $d^{\tau,H}(w, b)$, $d^{\tau,H}(w, a)$, $d^{\tau,H}(b, w)$ are all greater than or equal to $d^{\tau,H}(a, b)$.*
- *a side edge if $d^{\tau,H}(a, b) = 0$, $(b, a) \in E^{\tau,H}$ if and only if $S \in H$, $\{(a, a), (b, b)\} \subseteq E^{\tau,H}$ if and only if $R \in H$ and $d(a, a) = d(b, b) = 0$.*

By the above definition, the unique edge $(u_q, v_q) := (u, v) \in E_0$ with label τ and depth q is useful edge. Recall that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models \tau \leq t$. Therefore, there exists a node $w_q \in V^{\tau,H}$ such that $\{(u_q, w_q), (w_q, u_q), (w_q, v_q), (v_q, w_q)\} \subseteq E_1$. By the construction (Case 1), there exists an edge, $e_{q-1} = (u_{q-1}, v_{q-1}) \in \{(u_q, w_q), (w_q, u_q)\} \subseteq E_1$ that is useful and $d^{\tau,H}(e_{q-1}) = q-1$. Continuing in the same manner, we get a sequence of useful edges $e_q = (u_q, v_q), \ldots, e_1 = (u_1, v_1) \in E^{\tau,H}$, a side edge $e_0 = (u_0, v_0)$ and a sequence of nodes $w_q, \ldots, w_1 \in V^{\tau,H}$ such that

(a) $l^{\tau,H}(e_q) = \tau$ and $d^{\tau,H}(e_j) = j$ for every $0 \leq j \leq q$.

(b) $e_k \in \{(u_{k+1}, w_{k+1}), (w_{k+1}, v_{k+1})\}$ for every $0 \leq k < q$.

(c) For every $0 < k \leq q$ and every node $y \in V^{\tau,H} \setminus \{w_k\}$, if $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models l^{\tau,H}(u_k, y) \cdot l^{\tau,H}(u_k, w_k) \neq 0$ and $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models l^{\tau,H}(y, v_k) \cdot l^{\tau,H}(w_k, v_k) \neq 0$ then z is the unique node for the useful edge e_k mentioned in the above definition.

Step 4: We note that the selection of the sequence $e_q, \ldots, e_0$ is not unique. The idea of showing that τ is not an atom in $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$ is as follows. We extend $G^{\tau,H}$ to $G^{\tau,H}_+$ as follows. Recall that we have either $m \neq 0$ or $H \neq \{R, S\}$.

Suppose that $m \geq 1$ Pick a brand new node h and let $V^{\tau,H}_+ = V^{\tau,H} \cup \{h\}$. Define $E^{\tau,H}_+$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} E^{\tau,H}_+ &= E^{\tau,H} \cup \{(u_0, h), (h, v_0)\} \cup \{(h, h) : R \in H\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(h, u_0) : S \in H\} \cup \{(v_0, h) : S \in H\} \end{aligned}$$

We extend the labels as follows. For every $e \in E^{\tau,H}$, let $l^{\tau,H}_+(e) = l^{\tau,H}(e)$. If there is no $z \in V^{\tau,H}$ with $\{(u_0, z), (z, v_0)\} \subseteq E^{\tau,H}$ (in other words, if $S \notin H$), define

$$l^{\tau,H}_+(u_0, h) = l^{\tau,H}_+(h, u_1) = 0' \cdot \prod_{i \in m} -x_i.$$

If there is $z \in V^{\tau,H}$ with $\{(u_0, z), (z, v_0)\} \subseteq E^{\tau,H}$, then z is unique because (u_0, v_0) is a side edge of $G^{\tau,H}$. Since $m \geq 1$, then there exists $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in F^m_0$ such that $color_m(\gamma_1) \neq color_m(l^{\tau,H}(u_0, z))$ and $color_m(\gamma_2) \neq color_m(l^{\tau,H}(z, u_1))$. Define,

$$l^{\tau,H}_+(u_0, h) = \gamma_1 \text{ and } l^{\tau,H}_+(h, u_1) = \gamma_2.$$

Define,

$$l^{\tau,H}_+(h, u_0) = 0' \cdot \prod_{i \in m} -x_i \text{ if and only if } S \in H,$$

$$l^{\tau,H}_+(u_1, h) = 0' \cdot \prod_{i \in m} -x_i \text{ if and only if } S \in H$$

and

$$l^{\tau,H}_+(h, h) = 1' \cdot \prod_{i \in m} -x_i \text{ if and only if } R \in H.$$

The depths are extended in the natural way, $d^{\tau,H}_+(e) = d^{\tau,H}(e)$, for every $e \in dom(d^{\tau,H})$, $d^{\tau,H}_+(h, h) = 0$ and $d^{\tau,H}_+(e) = d$ if and only if $l^{\tau,H}_+(e) \in F^m_d$, for every $e \in E^{\tau,H}_+ \setminus E^{\tau,H}$ and every $d \leq q$.

Suppose $m = 0$ **and** $S \notin H$ Hence, extend $G^{\tau,H}$ by adding the converse of e_0. Let $V^{\tau,H}_+ := V^{\tau,H}$ and $E^{\tau,H}_+ = E^{\tau,H} \cup \{(v_0, u_0)\}$. Define $l^{\tau,H}_+(e) := l^{\tau,H}(e)$, for every $e \in E^{\tau,H}$, and $l^{\tau,H}_+(v_0, u_0) = 0' \cdot \prod_{i \in m} -x_i$. The depths are given by $d^{\tau,H}_+ = d^{\tau,H} \cup \{((v_0, u_0), 0)\}$.

Suppose $m = 0$ **and** $R \notin H$ We extend $G^{\tau,H}$ by adding the loop of (w_1, w_1). Let $V^{\tau,H}_+ := V^{\tau,H}$ and $E^{\tau,H}_+ = E^{\tau,H} \cup \{(w_1, w_1)\}$. Define $l^{\tau,H}_+(e) := l^{\tau,H}(e)$, for every $e \in E^{\tau,H}$ and $l^{\tau,H}_+(w_1, w_1) = 1' \cdot \prod_{i \in m} -x_i$. The depths remain as they were, i.e., $d^{\tau,H}_+ = d^{\tau,H}$.

Let $\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H} = \langle \mathcal{P}(E_+^{\tau,H}), \cap, \cup, \setminus, \emptyset, E_+^{\tau,H}, ;^{[E_+^{\tau,H}]}, ^{\smile[E_+^{\tau,H}]} \rangle$. Clearly $\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H} \in RRA_H$. Define the evaluation $\iota_+^{\tau,H} : \{x_0, \dots, x_{m-1}\} \to \mathcal{P}(E_+^{\tau,H})$ as follows. For every $i \in m$, $\iota_+^{\tau,H}(x_i) = \{e \in E_+^{\tau,H} : x_i \in color_m(l_+^{\tau,H}(e))\}$. The same argument used in proposition 4.2 can be used to prove the following.

$$(\forall e \in E_+^{\tau,H}) \quad (\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H}, \iota_+^{\tau,H}, e) \models l_+^{\tau,H}(e). \tag{6}$$

Step 5: Recall the useful edges $e_q, \dots, e_1$ and the side edge e_0. For every $0 \leq j \leq q$, let $son(e_j)$ and $daughter(e_j)$ be the unique terms in F_{j+1}^m such that

$$(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, e_j) \models son(e_j) \text{ and } (\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H}, \iota_+^{\tau,H}, e_j) \models daughter(e_j).$$

Hence, for every $0 \leq j \leq q$, $son(e_j)$ and $daughter(e_j)$ are non-zero forms and, by lemma 4.2 and equation (6) above, each of which is below the label of e_j in $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$. Now, we are ready to show that τ is not an atom in $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$. We use the conditions in the definition of the useful edges to show the following.

Ptoposition 4.3. *For every $0 \leq j \leq q$,*

$$\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models son(e_j) \cdot daughter(e_j) = 0.$$

Proof. By induction on j. By the special construction of $G_+^{\tau,H}$, it is clear that $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models son(e_0) \cdot daughter(e_0) = 0$. Suppose that, for some $j \leq q-1$, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models son(e_j) \cdot daughter(e_j) = 0$. We may assume that $e_j = (u_{j+1}, w_{j+1})$. Let $\sigma = D_{j+1}^{\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}}((w_{j+1}, v_{j+1}))$. By condition (c) and without loss of generality, we may assume that there is NO node $y \in V^{\tau,H} \setminus \{w_{j+1}\}$ with $\{(u_{j+1}, y), (y, v_{j+1})\} \subseteq E^{\tau,H}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (u_{j+1}, y)) \models son(e_j), \qquad && (\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (y, v_{j+1})) \models \sigma, \\ &(\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H}, \iota_+^{\tau,H}, (u_{j+1}, y)) \models son(e_j) && (\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H}, \iota_+^{\tau,H}, (y, v_{j+1})) \models \sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(\mathfrak{G}^{\tau,H}, \iota^{\tau,H}, (u_{j+1}, v_{j+1})) \models son(e_j); \sigma \text{ but } (\mathfrak{G}_+^{\tau,H}, \iota_+^{\tau,H}, (u_{j+1}, v_{j+1})) \models -(son(e_j); \sigma).$$

Therefore, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models son(e_{j+1}) \cdot daughter(e_{j+1}) = 0$, as desired. □

In particular, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models son(e_q) \cdot daughter(e_q) = 0$ and, hence, τ is not an atom in the free algebra $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$. Recall that τ was an arbitrary normal form with $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H \models 0 \neq \tau \leq t$. Hence, proving that τ is not an atom in $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$ yields to the following proposition.

Ptoposition 4.4. *Suppose that $m \neq 0$ or $H \neq \{R, S\}$. There is no atom in the free algebra $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$ that is below t. Therefore, $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$ is not atomic*

The remaining direction of theorem 4.1 follows from proposition 4.4. It would be nice to list all the atoms of the non atomic $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$'s. However, we believe that the free algebra $\mathfrak{Fr}_m RRA_H$ contains finitely many atoms if and only if $S \in H$.

Acknowledgment: The research to this article was sponsored by Central European University Foundation, Budapest (CEUBPF). The theses explained herein are representing the own ideas of the author, but not necessarily reflect the opinion of CEUBPF.

The research to this article was carried out at University College London, London (UCL), during a research visit program under the supervision of professor Robin Hirsch. It is also part of the author's PhD thesis under the supervision of Professors Hajnal Andréka and István Németi.

The author should like to thank Professors Hajnal Andréka and István Németi for reading all the drafts of the present paper and for their valuable comments and ideas. The author is thankful for Professors Robin Hirsch and Szabolcs Mikulás for the frequent meetings to discuss the ideas used in the presented results.

References

A. R. Anderson. Improved decision procedures for Lewis's calculus S4 and von Wright's calculus M. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 19(03):201–214, 1954.

H. Andréka. Complexity of equations valid in algebras of relations, part ii: Finite axiomatizations. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 89(2):211–229, 1991.

H. Andréka, J. D. Monk, and I. Németi, editors. *Algebraic Logic*, volume 54, Colloquia Mathematica Societatis János Bolyai. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1991.

H. Andréka, I. Németi, and I. Sain. On interpolation, amalgamation, universal algebra and Boolean algebras with operators. Math. Inst. Budapest, Preprint, 1994.

H. Andréka, A. Kurucz, I. Németi, I. Sain, and A. Simon. Causes and remedies for undecidability in arrow logics and in multi-modal logics. In *Marx et al. (1996b)*, pages 63–99. 1996.

H. Andréka, M. Ferenczi, and I. Németi, editors. *Cylindric-like algebras and algebraic logic*, volume 22. Springer Publishing Company, 2013.

S. Burris and H. Sankappanavar. *A course in universal algebra*, volume 2012. Springer New York, 1981.

K. Fine. Normal forms in modal logic. *Notre Dame journal of formal logic*, 16 (2):229–237, 1975.

D. M. Gabbay, A. Kurucz, F. Wolter, and M. Zakharyaschev. *Many-dimensional modal logics: theory and applications*. Elsevier, 2003.

Z. Gyenis. On atomicity of free algebras in certain cylindric-like varieties. *Logic Journal of IGPL*, 19(1):44–52, 2011.

L. Henkin, J. D. Monk, A. Tarski, H. Andréka, and I. Németi. *Cylindric Set Algebras*, volume 883 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, 1981.

R. Hirsch and I. Hodkinson. *Relation algebras by games*. North-Holland, 2002.

R. Kramer. Relativized relation algebras. In *Andréka et al. (1991)*, pages 293–349. 1991.

L. Löwenheim. Über möglichkeiten im relativkalkul. *Mathematische Annalen*, 76:447–470, 1915.

R. Maddux. Some varieties containing relation algebras. *Transaction of American Mathematical Society*, (272):501–526, 1982.

M. Marx. Relativized relation algebras. *Algebra Universalis*, 41(1):23–45, 1999.

M. Marx and Y. Venema. *Multi-dimensional modal logic*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.

M. Marx, Sz. Mikulás, I. Németi, and I. Sain. Investigations in arrow logic. In *Marx et al. (1996b)*, pages 35–61. 1996a.

M. Marx, L. Pólos, and M. Masuch, editors. *Arrow logic and multi-modal logic*. CSLI Publications Stanford, 1996b.

Sz. Mikulás. Strong completeness of the Lambek calculus with respect to relational semantics. In C. Rauszer, editor, *Algebraic Methods in Logic and in Computer Science*, pages 209–217. Banach Center Publications, 1993.

I. Németi. Logic with three variables has Gödel incompleteness property - thus free cylindric algebras are not atomic. Math. Inst. Budapest, Preprint, http://www.renyi.hu/ nemeti/NDis/NPrep85.pdf, 1985.

I. Németi. Free algebras and decidability in algebraic logic. DSc thesis, Hungarian Academy of Science, 1986.

I. Németi. Decidability of relation algebras with weakened associativity. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 100(2):340–344, 1987.

A. Tarski and S. R. Givant. *A formalization of set theory without variables*, volume 41. American Mathematical Society, 1987.

J. van Benthem. *Language in Action*. North-Holland, 1991.

J. van Benthem. A note on dynamic arrow logic. In J. van Eijck and A. Visser, editors, *Logic and Information Flow*, pages 15–29. The MIT Press, 1994.

J. van Benthem. *Exploring Logical Dynamics*. CSLI Publications, 1996.